

Questions and Answers-Post Pre-Proposal Conference-

Question: Two paragraphs in the Performance Specification, Rev 9, in 3.1.15.2.1 Weight, refer to multi-case systems, but the first paragraph is a two-person lift, and the second paragraph is a one-person lift. What is the difference between an accessory container and a transit case? Please clarify the difference between the 2 paragraphs.

3.1.15.2.1 Weight. The weight of the BAT Core Tester including tester power cables and self-test cables or of any one accessory container for the BAT System shall not exceed a two-person lift to 36 inches as defined for the "male only" population per MIL-STD-1472G, Section 5.8.6.3.1 (T) with an objective of a two-person lift to 36 inches as defined for the "male and female" population per MIL-STD-1472G, Section 5.8.6.3.1 or less (O). The BAT Core Tester shall not exceed two (2) transit cases. If the BAT Core Tester is packaged in two transit cases, the weight of each transit case shall not exceed a one person lift to 36 inches as defined for the "male only" population per MIL-STD-1472G, Section 5.8.6.3.1 (T) with an objective of a one-person lift to 36 inches as defined for the "Male and female" population per MIL-STD-1472G, Section 5.8.6.3.1 or less (O).

Answer: The transit case(s) for the Core Tester is (are) also the tester housing and has provision for storage of Core Tester power cables and self-test cables. The accessories containers are intended for the storage of TPS items for one aircraft, note that the accessory case needs to be ruggedized to the same level as the core tester.

Question: Based on the examples below from Sections L & M, is it intended that "Configuration Items" and Subassemblies (Modules) are interchangeable terms?

L.D. Functional Allocation & UUT Utilization Matrix. The offeror's written technical proposal shall provide a functional allocation of BAT Core Tester hardware and software Configuration Items (CIs) IAW Performance Specification, Paragraph 3.1.2, identification of non-developmental and developmental CIs, and potential impact to operating temperature requirements IAW MIL-PRF-28800F invoked by paragraph 3.1.16 of the BAT system performance specification, and a UUT Utilization Matrix of the identified CIs.

M.3.1.2 Configuration Item Reliability Risk Mitigation: This is met when the offeror's written technical proposal has identified a minimum of five (5) configuration items that pose the greatest reliability risk...

Answer: Yes - "Configuration Items" and Subassemblies (Modules) are interchangeable terms.

Question: The Government posted answers to questions on 14 April 2016. Some of the answers were not reflected in the latest draft RFP. Is the Government going to update the RFP and attachments to reflect the answers, in particular the Performance Specification. One example of this is: The Government answered earlier question saying they would provide quantity of RL cables to be tested. The Government did not provide this quantity in the 8 March 16 Performance Specifications.

Answer: The specific identification of RLA cables has been included in the Performance Specification dated 2 May 2016. Please see RFP, Performance Specification, dated 2 May 2016 and SOW, dated 4 May 2016 that reflect all changes, amendments in response to questions and comments received.

Question: RFP Reference: Section L.G.5- Narrative Basis of Estimate: Will the Government allow offerors to provide narrative basis of estimates on another tab in Attachment 11 or in an accompanying Word document, with an identifying reference in the BOE reference column? This will allow for more space to provide detailed basis of estimate narratives that appropriately justify the proposed Labor and Materials.

Answer: Narrative Basis of Estimate to be provided in an accompanying Word document. Section L.G.5-Narrative Basis of Estimate has been revised.

Question: CDRL A005 – IPMR: To allow adequate time for month-end processing, accurate technical and financial analysis of variances, and thorough preparation and review of all required IPMR formats, we respectfully request that the first IPMR submission be due 12 working days after the end of the second full accounting period following contract authority to proceed, and that subsequent submissions of the IPMR be due 12 working days after the end of the contractor's accounting period. This request for 12 days (versus 5 days) is in accordance with the Department of Defense IPMR Implementation Guide dated 05 February 2016, Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 as well as DI-MGMT-81861A.

Answer: The Government's submission requirement remains unchanged for CDRL A005-IPMR.

Question: CDRL A004 – CFSR: To allow adequate time for month-end processing, and accurate analysis of funding received and projected funding needs, respectfully request that CFSR submissions be due 25 calendar days (versus 5 working days) after the "as of" date of the report, which will occur at the end of each contractor accounting quarter (vs. month). This request is in accordance with DI-MGMT-81468.

Answer: The Government's submission requirement remains unchanged for CDRL A004-CFSR.

Question: When will the PPI tool be available for offerors on FedBizOpps?

Answer: PPI tool will be available for offerors on FedBizOpps when the RFP is posted.

Question: Atch_12_Excel_Cost_Model: Will the Government consider changing the cost model to use Contractor Fiscal Year (CFY) Rates rather than GFY rates to cost the proposal? If a CFY does not align with the GFY, costing hours at GFY rates created based on weighting CFY rates will not yield the same price as costing hours using the appropriate CFY rates based on the time spread of the hours. In addition, if contractors are to provide FPRR and/or FPRA documentation, the Government-approved rates in those documents will not tie to the GFY cost model rates, which will make it difficult for Government auditors to validate. Changing the cost model to use CFY will allow offerors to provide current, accurate and complete pricing. Offerors can then aggregate the cost at a GFY level to meet the Government's reporting needs.

Answer: The Government's requirement is based on Government Fiscal Year (GFY) thus the Excel Cost Model should be proposed in GFY rates.

Question: Section M, 3.1 Factor 1: Technical Factor, Subfactor 1: System Engineering, Functional Allocation & UUT Utilization Matrix, states: "This is met when the offeror's written technical proposal has provided a functional allocation of BAT Core Tester hardware and software Configuration Items (CIs) IAW Performance Specification, Paragraph 3.1.2, identification of all CIs as non-developmental or developmental, and a complete UUT Utilization Matrix that identifies all CIs by function that are required for testing of UUTs not listed in the previous bullet. Additionally, the set of CIs identified in the functional allocation is not likely to cause degradation of performance as it relates to operating temperature requirements IAW MIL-PRF-28800F invoked by Paragraph 3.1.16 of the BAT system performance specification." However, Section L, D. Volume II, Written Technical Proposal Subfactor 1: System Engineering, Functional Allocation & UUT Utilization Matrix, states: "The offeror's written technical proposal shall provide a functional allocation of BAT Core Tester hardware and software Configuration Items (CIs) IAW Performance Specification, Paragraph 3.1.2, identification of non-developmental and developmental CIs, and potential impact to operating temperature requirements IAW MIL-PRF-28800F invoked by paragraph 3.1.16 of the BAT system performance specification, and a UUT Utilization Matrix of the identified CIs. The UUT Utilization Matrix is not required to cover the UUTs listed in the previous bullet." Please confirm the Government is anticipating accepting solutions that do not meet the temperature requirements identified in the Performance Specification. Rather than accepting solutions that do not meet the temperature requirements in the performance specification, would the Government consider defining differing environmental requirements for the backshop vs the flightline?

Answer: The Government is not considering accepting solutions that do not meet the temperature requirement.

Question: Rather than accepting solutions that do not meet the temperature requirements in the performance specification, would the Government consider defining differing environmental requirements for the backshop vs the flight line?

Answer: As noted in the answer above, the Government is not considering accepting solutions that do not meet the temperature requirement. The Government will not consider defining separate environment requirements for the backshop and flight line.

Question: Section L, Volume II, Subfactor One, IMS, states: "The proposed IMS shall include top level schedule activities, events and milestones for Increments 2 and 3 with the duration of days from exercise of contract option to Critical Design Review (CDR) and Production Readiness Review (PRR) IAW SOW paragraphs 5.1.2, 5.1.7, 6.1.2, and 6.1.7, respectively."

- Please confirm the IMS requirements for Increments 2 and 3 are the same as for Increment 1.

Answer: The IMS requirements for Increments 2 and 3 are not the same as Increment 1. For Increments 2 and 3 the offeror is not required to provide additional IMS levels to address higher risk activities on the critical path.

- Please confirm the IMS should only include the EMD phases for Increments 2 and 3; and, not include the production phases.

Answer: Confirmed. The proposed IMS for Increments 2 and 3 will only cover the EMD phases and not include the production phase for Increment 2 and 3.